



SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 143

OF COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICES:

14959 South Pulaski Road Midlothian, IL 60445 (708) 388-6450 Fax: (708) 388-4793

MICHAEL A. HOLLINGSWORTH
Superintendent of Schools

BOARD OF EDUCATION

Joanne W. Keilman
President

Sharlene Innocenti
Vice President

Roxanne R. Huegel
Secretary

MEMBERS

Alison Dolbeer
Cheryl A. Grant
Laura Gunaka
JoAnne Lyons

Dr. Carrie Cahill
*Assistant Superintendent for
Curriculum and Personnel*
(708) 388-6450

Angela Crotty
Business Manager
(708) 388-6444

Marsha K. Amraen
Director of Student Services
(708) 388-6446

Central Park School
3621 West 151st Street
Colandra Hamilton, Principal
Adam Thorns, Assistant Principal
(708) 385-0045

Kolmar School
4500 West 143rd Street
Cathy M. Thompson, Principal
Michael Pecka, Assistant Principal
(708) 385-6747

Spaulding School
14811 Turner Avenue
Mary Grahovec, Principal and
Preschool Program Coordinator
(708) 385-4546

Springfield School
14620 Springfield Avenue
Colleen Langdon Sjostrom, Principal
(708) 388-4121

March 6, 2013

To Whom It May Concern:

RE: Request for Review

This letter comes to you to appeal the denial decision regarding a SPIN change for cellular services. Below is the necessary information to access our records:

Contact: Angela Crotty
14959 S. Pulaski Rd.
Midlothian, IL 60445
708-388-6444 – phone
708-388-4793 – fax
acrotty@msd143.org

CC Docket No. 02-6

Appellant Name: Midlothian School District 143

Applicant BEN: 135582

Original Service Provider: Verizon Wireless

Original Service Provider SPIN: 143000677

New Service Provider: Sprint Spectrum, L.P.

New Service Provider SPIN: 143006742

Form 471 Application #: 861813

Funding Request #: 2347179

It was stated that our appeal was "denied because your selection of the original service provider was in violation of competitive bidding rules of this support mechanism. Specifically, the vendor selection matrix you created during the **original** vendor evaluation period did not clearly demonstrate that price was the single most important criteria considered in selecting the winning service provider but was co-equal in importance with another factor." That is indeed false as indicated.

When we submitted our **original** information for a SPIN change request, a matrix was provided in number 18 (see attachment A) **which established**

price to be the primary factor, and in fact the only factor. We then received an email dated January, 18, 2013 (see attachment B) which asked for bid weighting factors and individual vendors' scores. Since we sent the matrix we used to select our initial vendor which established the price as the factor with weight of 100% and were still asked for more information, we attached points to the requirements of the service to try to illustrate that all factors were equal for all vendors since the other factors were required (though gave more points to requirements we felt were more important which was irrelevant since they were all required), thereby again leaving price as the primary factor. We were merely trying to show, by assigning a point value, that price was the only factor that was considered since in our description we listed our requirements. We cannot have phones without walkie-talkie capabilities and therefore if a bid was submitted without such, it could not be considered. USAC used that against us – responding that price was not the single most important factor, “but was co-equal” in importance with another factor. Again, the second matrix that they were referring to was only created (**after** the vendor was chosen using the first matrix weighing cost at 100%) in an attempt to help them understand that everything was equal among the bidders except for price. The original matrix clearly demonstrated that cost was the only factor at 100%.

It would be extremely unfair if the additional information we provided (that was created after the selection to try to explain cost was the only factor) was used against us. Again, the original matrix was used when we chose the initial vendor, which is in accordance with the procurement rules, who was unable to perform the service to which they committed; hence the SPIN change request. We worked diligently with the original service provider to work out a viable solution, however after several options were researched, the vendor said there was nothing more the company could do and that a change in vendors was the best solution; thereby, fulfilling the requirements of the Copan Order.

Obviously we did not do a good job attempting to illustrate our point in the second matrix, but one would assume that if the information received was not clear, communication via phone would have been made to personally discuss and obtain clarification.

The purpose of E-Rate funds, as we understand them for schools, is to provide funds for some school district technological operations. We fully understand there is a set of rules that is applicable to this program that must be followed. We DID follow the procurement rules and chose the lowest bidder, as per the E-Rate rules, as all other factors were required. We are asking that you use sound judgment and keep the purpose of E-rate in mind when assessing this issue.

Thank you in advance for your consideration.

Sincerely,



Angela Crotty
Business Manager

A

a.	original service provider	
b.	One-time pre-discount amount for new service provider	\$0.00
c.	Effective date of change	January 1, 2013
d.	Last day of service for new service provider	June 30, 2013

19. Please answer the following three questions:

Are all SPIN changes requested in this letter allowed under all applicable state and local procurement rules? Yes or No

Are the SPIN changes allowable under the terms of the contract, if any, between the applicant and its original service provider? Yes

Have you notified your original service provider of your intent to change service providers? Yes (If your service provider is no longer in business, have you attempted to contact them? N/A)

If you answered "No" to any of the questions, please explain.

20. Beginning with FY2011 FRNs, provide the following two items:

1. A detailed explanation of the need for the change.

We chose the lowest bidder, Verizon, who was unable to provide the service necessary. Verizon did initially visit our buildings before we chose them to be sure we could receive reception throughout all buildings. After testing, they were confident we would be able to without a problem. Once we received the phones and attempted to use them, service was awful. We did not get sufficient reception in most locations throughout all buildings. We then had safety issues because the phones could not be utilized during emergencies. The IT supervisor worked with Verizon to try to rectify the situation. Network extenders were installed to improve the situation, but it did not help. Together, Verizon and Midlothian School District concluded that Verizon was unable to provide the necessary service in our schools.

The final bid evaluation worksheet (a listing of the bid weighting factors and individual vendors' scores for all vendors that participated in the original competitive bidding process) for the services requested in FRN(s) associated with the SPIN change or, if applicable, a statement that there was only one or no bids received.

Cellular Services Matrix

Company	Required	Sprint	ATT	Verizon	Weight
# of Units	39	39	39	39	0
Pooled Min.	1200	1400	6700	4200	0
Total Cost		\$ 1,158.84	\$ 1,440.00	\$ 907.72	100%

B

Angela Crotty

From: Newton, Regina <Regina.NEWTON@sl.universalservice.org>
Sent: Friday, January 18, 2013 12:09 PM
To: Angela Crotty
Subject: MIDLOTHIAN SD - SPIN Change request for FRN 2347179

January 18, 2013

Angela Crotty
MIDLOTHIAN SCHOOL DISTRICT 143
Phone Number: 708-388-6450
Application Number: FY2012 FCC Form 471# 861813, FRN 2347179

Response Due Date: January 25, 2013

Your SPIN Change Request to Split FRN 2347179 did not include all the necessary information needed to complete the review your request. We have additional question(s).

(1)

1. Respond to this email and attach a copy of the final bid evaluation worksheet (including a listing of the bid weighting factors and individual vendors' scores for all vendors that participated in the original competitive bidding process for the services requested in FRN 2347179.

(2)

The Pre-Discount Monthly Amounts that you provided for the split of original FRN 2347179 with SPIN 143000677 and the new FRN with SPIN 143006742 would exceed the Approved Commitment Amount for FRN 2347179.

Approved Funding Commitment Amount for FRN 2347179 is as follows:

\$1044.00 Pre-Disc Per Month x 12 months of service x 82% discount = \$10272.96 Total Approved Commitment Amount

- For Original SPIN 143000677, FRN 2347179 you requested:

\$1044.00 pre-discount monthly x 06 months x 82% discount